

New Zealand Treasury
Guest Lecture Series
2006

Measuring Māori Wellbeing

Mason Durie
Massey University

1 August 2006

Wellington

MEASURING MĀORI WELLBEING

Mason Durie

Parameters of Wellbeing

Māori wellbeing can be measured from several perspectives and at a number of levels (Table 1).

Table 1 Frameworks for Measuring Māori Wellbeing

	Individuals <i>The wellbeing of individuals</i>	Collectives <i>The wellbeing of families, groups</i>	Populations <i>The wellbeing of whole populations</i>
Universal measures	Measures that are relevant to all people e.g. Life expectancy, mortality data	Measures that can be applied to diverse groups e.g. Aggregated data	Measures that apply to all populations & nations e.g. GNP, 'Global Burden of Disease'
Māori-Specific measures	Measures that are specific to Māori individuals e.g. Hua Oranga	Measures that are relevant to Māori collectives e.g. Whānau Capacities	Measures that are relevant to te ao Māori e.g. Te Ngahuru

Universal perspectives are premised on the notion that all people have common views about being well and therefore their wellbeing can be measured in similar ways.

Mortality rates are universal because they adopt an indicator (death) that transcends differentiated populations. The presence or absence of disease, and the attainment of tertiary education qualifications are also largely relevant across the total population, although there may be differences about their relative importance and the way in which they are understood. Standards of housing, health status and educational achievement often use measures that are applicable to all people regardless of ethnicity or age, though are not always sufficiently sensitive to capture population-specific perspectives.

Although universal indicators and measures can be applied to Māori as they can to other populations, there are also unique characteristics of Māori that require specific measurement.¹ Māori specific measures are attuned to Māori realities and to Māori

worldviews. A Māori-specific measure of adequate housing might take into account the level of provision for extended families and for manuhiri, while a measure of educational attainment might include measures that relate to the use and knowledge of Māori language.

In addition to the universal-specific dimension, the individual-group dimension needs to be considered. Measures of wellbeing can be applied to individuals, groups and whole populations. Measures for individual wellbeing are not necessarily applicable to family and whānau wellbeing, while measures of tribal wellbeing are not always the measures that are appropriate to generic Māori communities. A framework for quantifying hapū and iwi resources developed by Winiata in 1988, placed emphasis on cultural capital and tribal histories, as well as human and economic considerations.² At a population level, overall measures of the wellbeing of Māori require the use of indicators that go beyond sub-groups to encompass all Māori.

Three Levels of Wellbeing

To illustrate the point, it is useful to consider three levels of outcome measurement that focus separately on Māori as individuals, whānau, and Māori as a whole population. Each measure has been developed by taking into account Māori aspirations, Māori world views, the availability of quantitative indicators, and the concept of Māori-specific indicators.

Level One: Individual Wellbeing

Hua Oranga is a measure of outcome designed for users of mental health services. Based on a Māori health perspective, it assesses outcome from a holistic viewpoint and includes ratings from clinician, client and a family member.³ Using a calibrated scale, four dimensions of wellbeing are measured: taha wairua (spiritual health), taha hinengaro (mental health) taha tinana (physical health) and taha whānau (relationships with family and community). While each dimension has parallels in other health measurement scales, the essential point of *Hua Oranga* is the balance that exists between dimensions. A satisfactory level of physical health, measured by indicators such as weight, blood pressure and respiratory capacity is not by itself a complete measure since it fails to accommodate spiritual mental and family dimensions.

Hua Oranga enables a comprehensive assessment of wellbeing to be made and has found practical uses in health services. Based on a Māori perspective of health, it can be regarded as a Māori-specific instrument, though clearly has implications for other populations including indigenous peoples, as well.

Level Two Whānau Wellbeing

Measures of wellbeing for groups require different approaches. A way to measure the wellbeing of whānau for example is to assess the collective capacity to perform tasks that are within the scope and influence of whānau (Table 2).

Table 2 *Whānau Capacities*

Capacity	Function	Focus
Manaakitanga	Whānau care	Wellbeing of whānau members
Pupuri Taonga	Guardianship	Management of whānau estate
Whakamana	Empowerment	Whānau participation in society
Whakatakato Tikanga	Planning	Future generations
Whakapūmau Tikanga	Cultural endorsement	Whānau members, whānau protocols
Whakawhānaungatanga	Whānau consensus	Whānau cohesiveness

Six primary capacities have been identified: the capacity to care; the capacity for guardianship; the capacity to empower; the capacity for long term planning, the capacity to endorse Māori culture, knowledge and values, and the capacity for consensus.⁴

The capacity to care, manaakitanga, is a critical role for whānau especially in respect of children and older members. Care also entails the promotion of lifestyles that are consistent with tikanga Māori, maximum well-being, mobility and independence, full participation in society, and reciprocated care for other whānau members. The best outcome is one where whānau members have a strong sense of identity, feel well cared for, are able to enjoy quality lifestyles with a sense of independence, yet remain concerned about the wellbeing of other whānau members.

The capacity for guardianship, pupuri taonga, expects whānau to act as wise trustees for the whānau estate – whenua tūpuna (customary land), heritage sites such as fishing spots, environmental sites of special whānau significance, urupa and wāhi tapu. A

desirable outcome is one where whānau assets increase in value and whānau members are actively involved in decision-making about the estate.

The capacity to empower, whakamana, is a whānau function that facilitates the entry of members of the whānau into the wider community, as individuals and as Māori. The whānau might be the gateway into the marae, or into sport, or to school, or to work. A good outcome is one where whānau members can participate fully, as Māori, in te ao Māori (the Māori world) and te ao whānau (wider society), and whānau are well represented in community endeavours.

The capacity to plan ahead, whakatakato tikanga, requires a capacity to anticipate the needs of future generations and to manage whānau resources (human and physical) so that those needs may be met. A good outcome will be one where systems are in place to protect the interests of future generations and whānau have agreed-upon broad strategies for further whānau development.

The capacity to promote culture, whakapūmau tikanga, is a further whānau function. It depends on the capacity to transmit language, cultural values, narratives, song, music and history. A good outcome is one where whānau members have access to the cultural heritage of the whānau, are both fluent in te reo Māori, knowledgeable about whānau heritage, and actively support the whānau as the major agent of cultural transmission.

The capacity for consensus, whakawhānaungatanga, reflects the need for whānau to develop decision-making processes where consensus is possible and collective action strengthened. In order to reach consensus there must be opportunities for contributions to a shared vision and processes that enable whānau to take decisions in a way that is fair and consistent with tikanga. Strong interconnectedness within the whānau and better overall results is a desired outcome of consensual capacity.

Outcome Measures for Whānau Wellbeing

It will be apparent that the usual indicators of socio-economic status such as sickness, school failure, low incomes or deprivation scores are inadequate measures of whānau outcomes. The whānau capacity model emphasises progressive advancement rather

than the management of adversity and the focus is on functional capacities. For each capacity it is possible to identify goals and indicators. For example, the capacity for guardianship can be measured by increases in the value of whānau landholdings (using valuation and Māori Land Court data), while the capacity to plan ahead might be measured by the establishment of an education plan for future generations.⁵

Level Three Wellbeing of the Māori Population

Outcome Domains

To assist in the identification of specific outcomes and indicators that can be used as a global measure of Māori wellbeing, an outcomes schema, Te Ngāhuru, has been developed (Table 3).⁶

Table 3 *Te Ngāhuru A Māori Specific Outcome Matrix*

Principles				
Connectedness	Specificity	Māori focussed	Commonalities	Relevance
<i>Outcome Domains</i>	<i>Human Capacity</i>		<i>Resource Capacity</i>	
Outcome classes	Secure cultural identity (individuals)	Collective Māori synergies (groups)	Cultural & intellectual resources	The Māori estate (lands, forests, fisheries, waahi tapu)
Outcome Goals	e.g. Participation in society as Māori	e.g. Vibrant Māori communities	e.g. Māori language resources	e.g. Regenerated land base
Targets and Indicators				

Source: Durie et. al. 2002

Based on five principles (Connectedness, Specificity, Māori focussed, Commonalities, Relevance), two broad domains of outcome can be identified: human capacity and resource capacity. Human capacity reflects the way in which Māori are able to participate as Māori in society generally, as well as in Māori society. It is concerned with individuals and groups. In contrast, the resource capacity outcome domain refers to the state of Māori resources, including cultural and intellectual resources as well as physical resources.

Outcome Classes

Arising from the domains of outcome are four outcome classes:

- Te Manawa - a secure cultural identity
- Te Kāhui - collective Māori synergies
- Te Kete Puawai, Māori cultural and intellectual resources
- Te Ao Turoa, the Māori estate.

Te Manawa: a Secure Cultural Identity

A secure cultural identity results from individuals being able to access te ao Māori and to participate in those institutions, activities and systems that form the foundations of Māori society. Over time those institutions have changed so that the marae is not necessarily the key cornerstone of Māori society for all Māori. But other institutions can be identified as agents that contribute to the development of a secure cultural identity.

Te Kahui: Collective Māori Synergies

An important consideration for Māori is the notion of community itself. While there is a link between personal well-being and community well-being, there is also evidence that community well-being may itself be a driver of personal well-being. Where community cohesion is low, personal well-being is threatened. The notion of collective Māori synergies emphasises a community dynamic; it is an outcome class that measures collective well-being.

Te Kete Puawai: Māori Cultural and Intellectual Resources

Māori language is one measure of a cultural resource; others include Māori values, knowledge, arts, and customs. The state of cultural and intellectual resources is an important consideration because cultural and intellectual resources are fundamental components of modern Māori society.

Te Ao Turoa: the Māori Estate

A frequently expressed Māori view is that present generations are trustees for future generations, especially in connection with land and the environment. A good outcome will therefore be one where the value of physical resources accrues so that future generations can enjoy an expanded Māori estate. Given the rapidly increasing

Māori population, the estate will have reducing significance unless its size and value is increased. An important outcome target therefore will related to the growth of the aggregated physical resource base.

Outcome goals

The four outcome classes are broadly based and give rise to outcome goals that can be applied with greater specificity to interventions and policies (Table 4).

Table 4 Outcome Goals

<i>Te Manawa:</i> secure cultural identity for Māori individuals	<i>Te Kāhui:</i> collective Māori synergies	<i>Te Kete Puawai:</i> Māori cultural and intellectual resources	<i>Te Ao Turoa:</i> the Māori estate
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive Māori participation in society as Māori • Positive Māori participation in Māori society. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vibrant Māori communities • Enhanced whānau capacities • Māori autonomy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Te Reo Māori in multiple domains • Practise of Māori culture, knowledge and values. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regenerated Māori land base • Guaranteed Māori access to a clean and healthy environment • Resource sustainability and accessibility.

Participation as Māori

While generic measures such as educational achievement can capture aspects of participation, participation as Māori (e.g. using a Māori health service or joining a Māori sports team or enrolling on a Māori roll) requires the use of Māori specific measures. Participation *of* a Māori is different from participation *as* a Māori. Both have important implications for outcome and each is related to personal well-being but they do not convey the same meaning. Māori are more able to participate in society as Māori if they have a secure cultural identity. Indicators might include enrolment on the Māori electoral roll, employment in Māori designated positions, participation in Māori affirmative action programmes, and involvement in Māori cultural and sporting teams.

Participation in te ao Māori

It is well accepted that Māori well-being depends not only on participation and achievement in the wider society but also participation and achievement in Māori society. Active participation in the Māori world is closely linked to a secure cultural identity. In fact the measurement of a secure cultural identity hinges around involvement with the range of institutions, activities and systems that underlie Māori society. Indicators include marae participation, involvement in Māori networks and knowledge of whakapapa.

Vibrant Māori Communities

An important outcome for Māori is measured by the vibrancy of a Māori community. It reflects the way a community is organised and the positive attributions that can result to the population involved. Communities may be geographic, regional, national or based on shared interests (e.g. a kohanga community). There is a link between a vibrant community and the well-being of its members but in any case the vibrancy of the community is itself a measure of outcome because it suggests a level of involvement that builds on collective energies and contributes to a collective sense of welfare, safety and motivation. Indicators of a vibrant Māori community could be based on the number of institutions, kapa haka teams, active marae, sports clubs, Māori committees, radio stations, the size of the Māori electoral roll, and the vibrancy of national Maori organisations.

Enhanced Whānau Capacities

A further indication of a collective Māori capacity is the enhancement of whānau capacities. A well functioning whānau has the potential to point its own members towards good outcomes in both generic and Māori senses. Because the whānau is a foundation Māori institution its performance warrants close monitoring. Indicators might include the number of older Māori cared for by whānau, whānau land trusts, whānau businesses.

Autonomy

There is some debate whether autonomy is part of a process that leads to certain results or whether it is itself an endpoint. However, in view of the weight given to it as an outcome by key informants, it has been included as an outcome goal alongside

the other goals that measure a collective Māori outcome. It is consistent with the theme of ‘by Māori for Māori’. Although autonomy is always relative rather than absolute, and is often associated with iwi organisations, especially when it is expressed as tino rangatiratanga, it can be applied at several levels and in a variety of situations. Māori provider organisations (e.g. kura kaupapa Māori), marae committees, Māori boards, Māori companies are examples of Māori autonomy and constitute possible indicators.

Te Reo Māori

The use of Māori language is widely regarded as a major indicator of ‘being Māori.’ Language has been described as the essential ingredient of culture and a key to cultural identity. It is therefore included as an outcome goal in its own right. However, there are two equally important aspects of Māori language usage. First is the extent of usage by Māori and second is the number of domains where it is possible to speak, hear, read or write Māori. There is evidence to suggest that unless multiple domains of usage are available, the use of Māori language will be confined to narrow ‘cultural sites’ that may act as disincentives to some people.

A good outcome would be one where te reo Māori was spoken, by large sections of the Māori population and in many domains. Indicators include the number of adults able to converse in Māori; number of Māori enrolled in Māori language courses; number of children attending Māori immersion schools; number of Māori immersion courses available at all levels of the education sector; number of domains where Māori use is encouraged.

Culture, Values, Knowledge

The practise of Māori culture, knowledge and values constitutes an important outcome goal. The emphasis on culture, knowledge and values is intended to construct an outcome goal that is relevant to all Māori. Tikanga and kawa vary according to iwi and hapu but there are some values that are shared in all Māori traditions and which constitute an important core of Māori culture and philosophy e.g. manaakitanga, kaitiakitanga, karakia. A positive outcome is one where Māori values form an integral part of everyday lives, Māori culture is expressed on a ‘taken for granted’ basis, and traditional Māori knowledge is both retained and developed.

Marae attendances, kohanga, use of karakia, kaumātua presence, are possible indicators.

Regenerated Land Base

Some Māori resources such as land are owned by hapu or whānau; others, including fisheries are associated with an iwi. At an aggregated level, however, the size and value of Māori resources is an indication of the size of the Māori estate that will be available for future generations. While there is current debate about ownership issues, the important point is that the total resource can be seen as a Māori resource that will not only contribute to Māori wealth, but will also represent the physical heritage available to descendants. A regenerated Māori land base refers to a three dimensional shift: an expanded land base, a land base that is of greater economic value; a land base that is more widely accessible to Māori. Indicators could include Māori Land Court records, land valuations, succession to Māori land titles.

The Environment

Māori world-views place value on the environment and the values that underpin kaitiakitanga. An important outcome area for Māori is therefore related to access to an environment that is clean and healthy. It is necessary to assess the results of environmental management in order to determine the extent to which Māori environmental ethics have been retained. A good result is one where there is evidence of ongoing application of Māori values, reflected in a pristine environment. Moreover, unless Māori are able to access the physical environment, as of right, then the outcome will be unsatisfactory. Both access and environmental quality are the characteristics of this outcome goal. Evidence of adoption of a Māori environmental ethic, resource consents, regeneration of native bush, could be converted for use as indicators.

Resource Sustainability

The resources that physically belong to te ao Māori are generally under threat. Fish, flora, and fauna have been harvested to the point of actual extinction (in the case of the huia) and near extinction (in the case of kereru). The resource sustainability outcome goal is defined by sustainable harvesting practices, an expanding resource, and wide Māori access to the resource. A good outcome is one where Māori are able

to have access to the resource without threatening sustainability and consistent with an expansion of the size of the resource. As with other components of the Māori estate, an important consideration is ensuring that future generations are able to inherit resources that have been considerably enhanced in value. Retention (of a resource) without development is not compatible with obligations of one generation to those yet to come. Indicators can be built around the quantity, value and accessibility of resources e.g. fish, birds, plants.

Outcome Targets

Outcome goals represent relatively undifferentiated outcomes. In order to achieve a higher level of specificity, and to give more precise focus, it is necessary to develop targets for each goal. Outcome targets for each goal might be decided according to the area under examination and in association with key participants. Targets should be quite specific and measurable. For example a target in the *Autonomy* goal might be to establish an additional (and specific) number of Māori health providers. A target for the *Te Reo Māori* goal might be to ensure that at least one new domain where Māori can be spoken and heard is developed each year. A target for the *Positive Māori Participation in Māori Society* goal could be to establish a specified number of Māori designated positions within a certain sector. Targets would require agreement as to the best indicators.

Principles

Underlying the three Māori outcome frameworks are four key principles (Table 5)

Table 5 Principles for Measuring Māori Wellbeing

Indigeneity	Integrated development	Multiple indicators	Commonalities
Human wellbeing is inseparable from the natural environment	Māori development is built on economic, cultural, social, and environmental cohesion.	A range of measures are necessary to assess outcomes for Māori.	Despite diversity, shared characteristics act to bind the Māori population.

Indigeneity

The principle of indigeneity is essentially based on a world view that emphasises the link between people and their natural environment as a fundamental starting point for most indigenous peoples.⁷ Arising from the close and enduring relationship with defined territories, land, and the natural world, it is possible to identify five secondary characteristics of indigeneity (Table 6).⁸

Table 6 Characteristics of Indigeneity

<i>Features</i>	<i>Key Element</i>
Primary Characteristic: An enduring relationship between populations, their territories, and the natural environment.	An ecological context for human endeavours
Secondary Characteristics (derived from the relationship with the environment): <ul style="list-style-type: none">• the relationship endures over centuries• the relationship is celebrated in custom and group interaction• the relationship gives rise to a system of knowledge, distinctive methodologies, and an environmental ethic• the relationship facilitates balanced economic growth• the relationship contributes to the evolution and use of a unique language.	Time Identity Knowledge Sustainability Language

The indigeneity principle reflects an ecological orientation and is captured in the concept of tangata whenua which ascribes particular attributes to groups who have a special relationship with a defined locality.

Integrated Development

Māori experience over the past two decades has underlined the importance of an integrated approach to development. Sectoral development, in which economic, social, environmental and cultural policies are developed in parallel rather than from a common starting point, is inconsistent with indigenous world views where integration and holistic perspectives outweigh piecemeal approaches. A Māori capacity for integrated economic and social policy and planning will be critical for the next phase

of Māori development, otherwise Māori initiative will be constrained by a sectoral approach that will do little justice to the breadth of Māori aspirations.

Multiple Indicators

Because there is no single indicator that can accurately reflect the state of Māori wellbeing, more than one set of indicators should be employed. The sole use of narrow single-dimension measures ignores the several dimensions of Māori wellbeing. For individuals those dimensions reflect spiritual, physical, mental and social parameters; while for whānau they include the capacity for caring, planning, guardianship, empowerment, cultural endorsement, and consensus. For the Māori population as a whole, measurements that can gauge the overall wellbeing of human capacity (individuals and groups) and resource capacity (intellectual and physical resources), are necessary. Some of these measurements will employ economic measures, others will be measures of social and cultural capital, and other will be linked to measurements of environmental sustainability.

Commonalities

A focus on the Māori population uses norms and measures that are common to all Māori. They differ from hapu and iwi measures which are not applicable across the whole Māori population. Although Māori are far from homogenous and show a wide range of cultural, social and economic characteristics, there are nonetheless sufficient commonalities to warrant treatment as a distinctive population, at least for measuring social, economic and cultural parameters. While other measures will be necessary to identify hapu or iwi specific outcomes, the notion of a distinctive Māori population based on both descent and self identification, is sufficiently well grounded to justify conclusions about the population as a whole and the associated resources that are part of the collective Māori estate.

Conclusion

A widespread practice is to compare Māori wellbeing with the wellbeing of other population groups such as Pakeha, Pacific, and Asian. While such comparisons are useful, their utility is confined to the measurement of universal aspects of wellbeing (such as disease prevalence, educational attainment). However, holistic assessments of Māori wellbeing do not readily lend themselves to cross-population comparisons

because they are largely linked to Māori-specific measurements. Comparisons with other indigenous populations who share similar world views, similar histories, and similar positions in society, are more valid. As an alternative to population comparisons, however, comparisons of Māori with Māori at different periods of time might be more indicative of progress.

The measurement of Māori wellbeing requires an approach that is able to reflect Māori world views, especially the close relationship between people and the environment. This ecological orientation carries with it an expectation that social economic and environmental aspects of wellbeing will be given adequate consideration and that cultural and physical resources will be similarly considered alongside personal wellbeing. In short there is no single measure of wellbeing; instead a range of measures are necessary so that the circumstances of individuals and groups, as well as the relationships, perspectives, and assets within te ao Māori can be quantified and monitored.

¹ Te Puni Kokiri (2001) *A Framework for Monitoring Maori Development, working paper one*, Ministry of Maori Development, Wellington.

² Whatarangi Winiata, (1988), 'Hapu and Iwi Resources and their Quantification', in Royal Commission of Social Policy, *The April Report Volume Three Part Two*, pp. 791-803.

³ Kingi Te K. (2002), *Hua Oranga A Māori Mental Health Outcome Measure*, Ph D Thesis, Massey University, Palmerston North.

⁴ For earlier and detailed discussions see Durie, M. (1997), Whānau and Whānaungatanga in ed. Te Whaiti, McCarthy, Durie, *Mai i Rangiatea Māori Wellbeing and Development* Auckland University Press with Bridget Williams, Auckland, pp. 9-12.
And Durie, M. (2001), *Mauri Ora The Dynamics of Māori Health*, Oxford University Press, Auckland, pp. 185-217. The current model has been developed from the earlier versions.

⁵ Te Puni Kokiri (ed.), (2003), *Proceedings of Whakapūmau Whānau Whānau Development Hui 24 and 25 March 2003*, Ministry of Māori Development, Wellington

⁶ Mason Durie, E. Fitzgerald, Te K. Kingi, S. McKinley, B. Stevenson, (2002), *Māori Specific Outcomes And Indicators, A Report Prepared For Te Puni Kōkiri The Ministry Of Māori Development*, School of Māori Studies, Massey University

⁷ L.Kame'eleihiwa. *Native Land and Foreign Desires Pehea Lā E Pono Ai?* Bishop Museum Press: Honolulu; 1992. 23-25.

⁸ Mason Durie, (2005), *Nga Tai Matatu Tides of Māori Endurance*, Oxford University Press, Auckland.